DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 673 EA 024 609

AUTHOR Marsh, David D.
TITLE Change in Schools.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Decentralization; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Change; *Program Implementation; *School Based Management; School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

Ways in which strategies drawn from the local change process literature can enhance the broader implementation of a new approach to site-based management (SBM) are described in this paper. The first section presents a new conceptual framework for SBM that is based on decentralizing power, knowledge, information, and rewards within systemic redesign of the educational system (Lawler and Mohrman 1992). The second section offers a review of local change literature, highlighting six complementary "lenses"--implementing innovations, linking policy and practice, local change strategies, teacher professional culture and institutional norms, change as a holistic journey, and changes in individuals. Section 3 proposes strategies drawn from the local change process literature for implementing the new vision of SBM. The final section concludes that: (1) weak implementation processes have contributed to SBM's lack of effectiveness; (2) SBM requires a robust implementation process; and (3) new forms of knowledge and information linked directly to student outcomes are needed. (Contains 50 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353673

Change In Schools

David D. Marsh
University of Southern California

November, 1992.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Marsh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A chapter to appear in P. Wohlstetter and S. Mohrman (Eds.) Designing High Performance Schools: Strategies for School-Based Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

EA 024 609

Introduction

There has been a dramatic shift in the focus of reform in American schools over the last twenty years. In the 1970's, the focus of reform was on the implementation of innovations that were thought to be effective. The next wave of reform, as Cuban (1990) has characterized it, focused on making the existing system work better in traditional terms--standardized pupil achievement. Spurred by the 1983 national report, A Nation at Risk, this wave of reform emphasized more years of traditional subjects, higher standards, a longer school year and school day, and increased evaluation of teachers.

In the mid to late 1980's, the focus of reform shifted to teacher professionalism and "site-based management", often as ends in themselves. This wave of reform was launched in large urban districts such as Rochester, Toledo, Dade County, Florida, Chicago, San Diego, and Los Angeles. Typically, site based management was emphasized with a focus on restructuring the teacher/administrator relationship and giving more authority to schools. Another emphasis was on teacher professionalism and school culture which included how norms of collegiality, continuous improvement, common technical language and experimentation could be enhanced.

Beginning in the late 1980's, the focus of reform evolved towards powerful new views of classrooms, students, and outcomes. The point of departure for these reforms has been new perspectives on student learning: the importance of complex problem-solving, conceptual understanding, and powerful communication skills linked to substantive understanding. While this emphasis is not new in the sense that it was first proposed in the late 1980's, it did receive new significance, a new schooling context and new justification. For the first time, policymakers and practitioners were trying to create an educational system where all students are learning to think, solve complex problems and communicate at high international standards.

Features of the new educational approach include:

1. Assessment. An emphasis on performance assessment that captures students' conceptual understandings, complex problem-solving skills and powerful communication abilities; provides a guide for students, teachers, parents and the broader community about what matters in schools; engages students in meaningful activities that stimulate their reflection and intention to improve; informs both students and teachers in a way that is much more integrated much more closely with instruction; links within-school assessment to systemwide accountability; and provides a better yardstick by which to judge student progress and school accountability.

2. Curriculum. An emphasis on all students engaged in a core curriculum that is focused on the new student outcomes; that is characterized by depth over coverage; a new concept of scope and sequence that integrates knowledge across subjects and grade levels, and uses a constructivist view of knowledge; requires an integrated view of academic, applied academic and experiential knowledge so that all students learn how to think and make things work in the real world; and creates new linkages of schooling to the "outside" world.

3. Instruction/Teaching. An emphasis on learning activities that are substantially more challenging, meaningful and engaging; uses manipulatives and practical application; places the teacher in the role of "coach"; the textbook and other instructional materials used as resources; forges student connections to each other and the school in support of learning; supports new approaches to "remediation"; extensively uses student collaborative work; and incorporates comprehensive language support as part of teaching/learning.

4. School Organization and Culture. An emphasis on having student outcomes (rather than rules) "drive" the school organization and culture; structures flexible use of time to enhance student learning; develops clusters/houses/etc. that create meaningful units of

teacher-teacher and teacher-student collaboration; and reinforces teacher professionalism that is linked to student outcomes.

Earlier approaches to reform weren't discarded so much as transformed and incorporated in the evolving view of what would create the most meaningful and important changes in the schooling of American students. The challenge is to determine the most powerful pathway to achieve the new view of schooling that evolved in the lastest, and perhaps most vital wave of educational reform. Site based management has emerged as the predominant pathway. The evidence for this pathway comes primarily from experience and literature at the level of local change.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore how strategies drawn from the local change literature could enhance the implementation of a new approach to site-based management (SBM) on a broader scale. The focus on site-based management is not justified because of its brilliant track record in education. Others have correctly argued that, to date, site-based management has been tried in education only in limited ways, and with only limited success (Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992). Instead, site-based management is the focus of the paper because: a) a new conceptual framework for site-based management seems to hold such promise for achieving important results in the new reform, and b) site-based management is increasingly the center of research and policy attention about how best to proceed with the comprehensive restructuring of America's schools.

The literature on the local change process in education will be used to suggest strategies for implementation of this new approach to site-based management. For this purpose, the literature on the local change process in education has several important characteristics:

1. It has a long history of theoretical and empirical research that has utilized a multi-disciplinary perspective.
2. It has a set of tangible and useful findings, a set of literature reviews and action-oriented

propositional knowledge that can inform (in this case) what could be done to enhance site-based management.

3. Its focus has evolved to fit the various waves of reform in education: however, for the more recent waves of reform, the change literature has a strong conceptual perspective and relevant clinical insights, yet with a less-developed empirical base.

These characteristics make the literature very useful to the problem of implementing a new framework for site-based management. However, the application of the local change literature must be done with perspective and caution.

The rest of this paper is organized into three sections. The first section presents a new conceptual framework for site-based management. The second section summarizes the local change literature in ways that will integrate that literature for the reader and establishes principles that guide section three. In section three, the local change literature is used to propose how the new view of SBM might better be implemented. A final short section provides conclusions to be drawn from this application of the change literature. Across all the sections are the assumptions that: a) schools ought to focus on higher order thinking, conceptual understanding and powerful communication for all students, b) a fundamental redesign of the system of schooling will be needed to achieve these student outcomes for all students, c) this view of schooling for all students has never been truly implemented in American schools, and d) SBM can play a very key role in the establishment of such schooling outcomes in the future.

A New Perspective on Site-based Management

Wohlstetter and Odden (1992) reviewed the use of SBM and found that it is "everywhere" yet "nowhere". It is "everywhere" in the sense that active efforts are afoot across the nation to implement SBM. But, from the perspective of the conceptual framework they use in their

analysis, SBM has rarely been adequately implemented in education. Other authors confirm both the extensive interest (Clune & White, 1988) and the limited actual implementation (Clune & White, 1988; Malen & Ogawa, 1988; Wohlstetter & Buffet, 1992).

As Mohrman has described in the last chapter of this book, site-based management must be set in the context of large-scale system redesign. In this context, site-based management is part of a systemic change and not an isolated product, program or practice. Lawler (1986) and Mohrman, Lawler, and Mohrman (1992) propose a conceptual framework for examining site-based management using four elements of participation. In the first chapter of this book, Wohlstetter and Mohrman have summarized these elements as:

- Power to make decisions that influence organizational practices, policies and directions. The two major power authorities are those over budget and personnel.
- Knowledge that enables employees to understand and contribute to organizational performance. Knowledge includes both technical knowledge to do the job or provide the service, and managerial knowledge on decentralized management.
- Information about the performance of the organization, including revenues, expenditures and unit performance.
- Rewards that are based on the performance of the organization and the contributions of individuals. Rewards entail the compensation structure. Most effective decentralization control attempts to shift to a knowledge and skills-based pay structure.

It is these four elements of participation in site-based management that provide the operational definition of site-based management in this chapter. These four elements--power, knowledge, information and rewards--also provide the structure for the discussion of how the local change literature could enhance the implementation of site-based management in section 3 of this chapter.

Lawler (1986) argues that decision-making power should be seen in terms of a continuum of decision-making styles that range from top-down through pure delegation of decisions. He proposes three types of decisions:

- Day-to-day conducting of business, including rate of productivity, quality, work methods, and procedures.
- Higher-level strategy decisions, including how the organization should be structured and financed.
- Human resource management, including pay, staffing, promotion, training, and other issues that effect careers and rewards.

Information flow is also important to the success of participative management approaches. Lawler (1986) emphasizes the need for both the downward and the upward flow of information, and attention to both the kinds of information and how individuals can get access to the information. Rewards, says Lawler (1986) should include both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and focus on collective, rather than primarily individual, productivity.

Mohrman, Lawler, and Mohrman (1992) examine the application of this framework for educational settings. They begin by contrasting employee involvement using three categories: parallel suggestion involvement (such as quality circles where employees are asked to make suggestions through a structure that parallels the regular organization structure), job involvement (such as job enrichment or work groups that don't change the overall organizational structure), and high involvement (comprehensive involvement efforts that structure an organization so that people at the lowest level will have a sense of involvement, not just in how they do their jobs or how effectively their group performs, but in the performance of the total organization) (Mohrman et al, p.5). They then observe that the work of educating is "complex, uncertain and highly interdependent. Therefore, higher level forms of involvement are called for." (p.12). Schools

that choose the high involvement approach need to address design issues that include: technology (the nature of the work of the organization), organizational structure, organizational boundaries, customer definition and relation to stakeholders, measures, and rewards.

The Literature on the Local Change Process in Education

The local change literature can be summarized in terms of several complementary "lenses" that focus strategies for enhancing SBM in school settings. These lenses are:

Lens 1: Implementing Innovations (an outdated lens)

Lens 2: Linking Policy and Practice

Lens 3: Local Change Strategies--stages, factors, roles

Lens 4: Teacher Professional Culture and Institutional Norms

Lens 5: Change as a Holistic Journey

Lens 6: Changes in Individuals--paradigms, attitudes and practice

Collectively, the lenses provide insight about how to implement SBM as part of systemic reform.

Lens 1: Implementing Innovations. Early writing concerning the local change process emphasized strategies for designing and adopting innovations in educational settings. In the research/ dissemination/utilization (RDU) literature, it was assumed that innovations came from outside the receiver organization and were selected by rational users who also didn't "ruin" the innovation through inappropriate adaptation (Havelock, 1973; Hood & Cates, 1978). Rogers (1962) summary of the dissemination literature across many aspects of agriculture and technology-strongly influenced thinking about innovations in education. This literature has limited value for implementing SBM as part of systemic reform because of its focus on isolated and technologically-dominant innovations and its concern for teacher-proof change processes. The literature does have some value in showing how teachers acquire information from outside their

local sources and how they can achieve the rewards associated with implementation.

Another line of early research focused on implementing home-grown and poorly developed innovations through the mutual adaption of the innovation and the organization. The RAND Change Agent Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978) focused on factors within the local setting that were associated with full implementation or institutionalization of new programs. The study launched the stages of planned change paradigm that continues to influence the field and pointed more specifically to the importance of: a) assistance (staff development and support) that is so central to the knowledge component of the Lawler framework, and b) institutional motivation and rewards for implementation. For implementing SBM, however, the implementation literature lacks a focus on research-based and well-designed systemic reform, gives insufficient attention to important change process variables and ignores the district and policy context.

Lens 2: Linking Policy and Practice. The systemic nature of change has been explored in the policy implementation literature (Odden, 1991; Smith & O'Day, 1990). This literature joins the macro and micro educational systems and is focused on improving the technical core of schooling and student outcomes. Odden (1991) draws several important conclusions about the linkages of policy and practice in fundamental reform:

1. The educational system responds swiftly when there is a consensus for educational change on the part of policymakers, especially for developmental efforts that focus on new curriculum and instruction.
2. Murphy et al (1985) reports that while the local school is the unit of organizational change, the local district together with the state are the units of system change. Systems can identify the substantive direction in which local units (like schools) must move while allowing sites to determine specifically how to move in those directions.

3. Many local educators appeared to have the technical expertise to make the changes implied by state educational reform.

4. Top-down initiation works, especially if implementing well-proven programs where top-down adoption is followed by teacher involvement and sustained staff development.

An important link between state policy and school-level change is the district office. Fullan (1991) has summarized a considerable body of research and offers several conclusions:

1. "District staff are typically the ones to introduce new district programs. Even when the source of change is elsewhere in the system, a powerful determining factor is how central office administrators take to the change. If they take it seriously, the change stands a chance of being implemented." (p. 197)

2. "The leader's conceptual understanding of the dynamics of organization, the process of change and the people in his or her jurisdiction represent the most generative (or degenerative, if it is missing) source of ideas about what goes in a plan and what steps have to be taken when things go wrong." (p. 198)

3. The central staff must provide specific implementation pressure and support. (p. 198)

Firestone (1989), Huberman and Miles (1984) and others have expanded the set of district functions that enhance successful reform.

Lens 3: Local Change Strategies--stages, factors, roles. The local change strategies literature builds on the traditional idea that change typically goes through a set of stages: initiation, implementation and institutionalization. For systemic reform that transformed classroom practice, however, Marsh and Odden (1991) found the importance of an antecedent stage that "built teacher professional knowledge and expertise critical for developing professional site culture..thus when the district moved onto adoption of (the next part of the reforms), site

culture 'took over' and continued a collegial, expertise driven, teacher led curriculum change process (Odden, 1991, p. 315). For enhancing the implementation of SBM, four stages will be used: antecedent, initiation/adoption, implementation, and institutionalization.

This lens also includes factors found to enhance initiation/adoption and implementation. Important factors and findings include:

1. Ambitious efforts were better.
2. High quality, proven effective programs worked better.
3. Top-down initiation could work, especially with central office support and commitment as well as site administrator support, commitment and knowledge.
4. Coordination of the change process by cross-role teams that included teacher participation is designing implementation.
5. Extensive, intensive and ongoing training and classroom specific assistance is required.
6. Teacher effort to try and teacher commitment that followed rather than preceded implementation.

(drawn from Odden, 1991, pp. 305-307).

A third part of the lens is the set of roles to be played by site administrators, teachers, consultants, community members and students. Fullan (1991) provides an extensive research summary for each role group.

Lens 4: Teacher Professional Culture and Institutional Norms. Another new theme in the local change process literature has been an examination of how teachers acquire knowledge and create a professional culture. Rosenholtz (1989) provided fresh perspective on the teachers' workplace that included shared goals, teacher collaboration, teacher learning, teacher certainty and teacher commitment: "without learning opportunities, task autonomy, and psychic rewards, teachers' sense of commitment seemed choked by a string of broken promises" (p. 209). Little

(1982, 1987) and Lieberman (1988) provide a rich perspective on the normative heart of teacher professional culture and how it can be nurtured. Important norms include: continuous improvement, collegiality, risk-taking, and experimentation.

Lieberman and McLaughlin (1992) extend the professional culture view with a synthesis of how teacher networks can enhance many aspects of a teachers' life. They report, "Teachers choose to become active in collegial networks because they afford occasion for professional development and colleagueship and reward participants with a renewed sense of purpose and efficacy. Networks offer a way for teachers to experience growth in their careers through deepened and expanded classroom expertise and new leadership roles." (p. 674).

Lens 5: Change as a holistic journey. More recently, the change literature has evolved into more holistic summaries of how change process should be viewed. One aspect of this newer work is the writing of Goodlad, Sizer, Slavin and Comer on how schooling can be viewed in more holistic terms. These authors hint but rarely explicate how the change should take place. Another aspect of the newer work in the summaries about change and restructured schools is found in Sarason (1990), Cuban (1990), Schlecty (1990), Barth (1990), and Fullan and Miles (1992). Fullan and Miles (1992) echo common themes in pointing to several principles:

1. Change is learning-loaded with uncertainty.
2. Change is a journey, not a blueprint.
3. Problems are our friends.
4. Change is resource hungry (time is energy and money).
5. Change requires the power to manage it (cross-role groups which require legitimacy and the complexity of empowerment).
6. Change is systemic (components and culture).
7. All large-scale change is implemented locally.

These lessons portray change as an ongoing process of "getting it better" through a

learning community.

Lens 6: Changes in Individuals--paradigms, attitudes and practice. A final lens focuses on the change process as a transition for individuals. Hall and Hord (1987) summarize the Concerns-based Adoption Model (CBAM) for planning and evaluating change. The model includes teachers concerns about an innovation (SoC)--seven stages that range from self, followed by task and then consequence concerns. A second part of the CBAM model are the actual levels of use (LoU)--eight levels that range from non-use through mechanical and then routine use and refinement. Finally, the "version"of the innovation that was actually used (Innovation Configuration) provides a picture of what version of the reform was used by individual users. The CBAM framework has value in analyzing how teachers might come to engage in decisions about budget/personnel (the Lawler power dimension), or when/why certain types of knowledge, information or rewards would be important to them. A second part of the lens focuses on the paradigm shifts which an individual goes through in taking on major new practice.

Strategies for Enhancing Site-Based Management

The literature on the local change process provides insights about how to enhance site-based management. These insights are discussed using Lawler and Mohrman's four elements (power, knowledge, information, and rewards) as the organizing framework. The operational definition of SBM for this chapter is decentralizing power, knowledge, information and rewards with educational organizations.

Enhancing Power

Strategy 1: Decision-making within SBM should be designed and implemented as part of a systemic reform--not an innovation. Conversely, avoid implementing SBM as an isolated innovation.

Drawing on the research/thought about the new schooling outcomes, policymakers such as

Odden (1991) and Smith and O'Day (1990) have proposed a new view of the technical core of schooling and using backward mapping, have proposed major redesign of the policy/practice linkages. SBM must be designed as part of a systemic reform, in part because of previous futile efforts to implement it as an isolated innovation in education.

Previous approaches to SBM in education have emphasized issues of: a) equity between decision-making partners, b) the importance of planning and a plan for school reform, c) SBM as a catalyst for schoolwide change, and d) the need to implement the created plan. From Lawler's perspective, these arrangements constitute the "parallel suggestions" model of SBM raised to a high level of hope that the suggestions would not just make incremental improvements, but would change the school in fundamental and important ways. Berman and Gjelten (1984) report that such efforts succeeded more in elementary than in secondary schools. In elementary schools, the effort was often seen as a process of change whereas in secondary schools, the effort was seen as a "program to be implemented" or as a funding source. For secondary schools, Marsh and Bowman (1987) report that SBM led to creating new school components that complemented rather than transformed schools, and focused on isolated sets of students rather than all students.

Levine and Eubanks (1989) point to six major change process obstacles in implementing previous versions of SBM, as follows:

1. Inadequate time, training, and technical assistance;
2. Difficulties of stimulating consideration and adaption of inconvenient changes;
3. Unresolved issues involving administrative leadership on the one hand and enhanced power among other participants on the other;
4. Constraints on teacher participation in decision-making;
5. Reluctance of administrators at all levels to give up traditional prerogatives; and
6. Restrictions imposed by school board, state, and federal regulations and contracts and

agreements with teacher organizations.

Beneath these implementation problems, Levine and Eubanks (1989) warn us of deeper dangers concerning the implementation of SBM:

1. The confusion between teacher satisfaction and student performance. Levine and Eubanks report that, "satisfaction may have been attained precisely through neglecting requirements for inconvenient institutional reform" (p. 20)
2. The substitution of site-based management approaches for central responsibilities involving initiation and support of comprehensive school reform efforts (p. 20)
3. The confusion between site-based management and the need to focus on: instructional leadership, organization and implementation of instructional services, teacher development, and expectations and monitoring of student performance (as reported in Fullan, 1991).

Similarly, David (1990) studied eight of the most advanced SBM districts in the nation and found that SBM efforts typically intended to make differences in terms of four aspects of schooling: curriculum and instruction, site decision-making, new staff roles, and student assessment/school accountability. To date, she reports that only changes in the lives of adults were achieved. This conclusion confirms patterns found in Berman and Gjelten (1984), Levine and Eubanks (1989), and Fullan (1991).

Serious concern has also been raised about the vitality of the decision-making process itself within these SBM councils (Berman & Gjelten, 1984; Malen & Ogawa, 1991). Malen and Ogawa go on to report that, "shared governance had done more than simply fail to alter traditional decision making relationships; it has actually worked to reaffirm them" (pp. 2-3). They go on to point out three sets of implementation problems related to the use of site-based councils:

1. Although the site councils are authorized policymakers, they functioned as ancillary advisors and proforma endorsers.
2. Teachers and parents were granted parity but principals and professionals controlled the partnerships.
3. Relations on the council were hindered by the composition of the council, the relative power and role orientations of the principal, and the norms of propriety and civility between role groups.

Working to avoid the pitfalls of previous experience in SBM will be an important perspective on making the new approaches to SBM more effective. Fullan (1991) concludes that, "while the school is the unit of change, the concept remains one of the most misunderstood in the field of school improvement"(p. 203).

Strategy 2 Design and implement power arrangements within SBM based on a view of the new learning outcomes for students

It might seem to be begging the question to have a set of school outcomes and design components in mind as a prerequisite to designing the decision-making arrangements at a school. However, the track record for schools getting from decision-making processes (such as site-based councils) to schooling outcomes or teaching/learning components is so marginal (as documented in strategy 1 above) that something else must be tried. Writers about policy implementation, the local change process and the nature of needed reforms emphasize the need to plan backwards from a view of what students will be learning (Odden, 1991; Elmore, 1988; Sizer, 1992, Schlecty, 1991).

Early experience with the implementation process for the new reforms in complex school organizations leads to several conclusions. First, decision-making should be designed after the new view of schooling outcomes and key schooling components are clear, and are built from this

new view. The opposite orientation--building site-based decision-making primarily in relation to the "top" of the district/school--leads to a vision-context paralysis.

Second, use of multiple decision-making structures at the school--especially ones that build directly from outcomes and school experience operation typically are needed. The schooling redesign often involves early-on shifts in the organizational structure of the school; in turn, the new organizational unit represents a vital new decision-making arrangement at the school. This organizational redesign creates new organizational units between the individual teacher and the whole school--units that feature having day-to-day control over many aspects of a given student's life at the school. These units may be a "house" (10 to 15 teachers who provide education to approximately 400 secondary school students) or a "cluster" (typically a math, a science, an English and a social studies teacher who work with approximately 120 students over 4 class periods). A department would not count as one of these units because: a) it typically is a support system not a delivery of day-to-day instruction and b) it involves teaching related to only one small slice of a student's day. In Lawler's terms, departments are functional structures which should give way to integrated service units like are described here.

These new organizational units have great potential as decision-making arrangements because they link planning, operation and accountability for particular students in meaningful ways. Shanker (1990) emphasizes how these units need to work with students over several years to have the sustained impact needed for accountability.

Third, improved coordination among the various decision-making units is crucial and is often ignored. For example, coordination of houses with department, teaching team and several schoolwide governance councils to enhance decision-making will be needed. More generically, coordinating decision-making that is primarily day-to-day with strategic decision-making will need articulation. This linkage has not been done very well according to the local change literature,

but examples from the vision-oriented restructuring experiences of lead schools are very promising.

Strategy 3: Implementing new power arrangements within SBM will require new models of collaboration across schools and districts.

New arrangements for power within SBM are not a matter of the centralization or decentralization of decision-making. Instead, decision-making must be redesigned based on new models of collaboration. Fullan (1991) summarizes four recent efforts described in the local change literature where new forms of school/ district collaboration in support of new forms of SBM were implemented. In one study, Louis (1989) examined the degree of engagement (frequent interaction and communication, mutual coordination and influence, some shared goals and objectives) and degree of bureaucratization (the presence of extensive rules and regulations governing the relationship between school and district). The pattern of high engagement and low bureaucracy was the only clearly positive district context. Louis summarizes this arrangement as, "Essentially, the picture is one of co-management with coordination and joint planning enhanced through the development of consensus between staff members at all levels about desired goals for education." (p. 161)

The new decision-making partnership will need to focus in a new way on personnel issues. Rosenholtz (1989) reports that in districts that are on the move, leaders helped teachers improve and considered firing or counseling out as a last resort. Conversely, Fullan (19910 reports that, "stuck districts, because of their internal isolationism, are less likely to take action against ineffective teachers." (p. 208). Overcoming isolationism is a function of knowledge and information that will be discussed in this chapter.

In summary, Fullan (1991) draws two broad conclusions about the change process linking decision-making (within SBM) between the school and the district:

1. Sustained improvement requires serious restructuring of the school, district and their interrelationships. The role of students, teachers, principals, parents and district staff are all affected, as is the structure, governance, and design of work and learning. (p. 209)
2. Equally important but less obvious is that schools cannot redesign themselves. The role of the district is crucial. Individual schools can become highly innovative for short periods of time, without the district, but they cannot stay innovative without district action to establish the conditions for continuous and long improvement. (p. 209).

Strategy 4: Implementing new power arrangements in SBM will require building a strong teacher professional culture

Lieberman (1988), Little (1987), Rosenholtz (1989) and Lieberman and McLaughlin (1992) propose that teacher culture is a major key to transforming schooling. In their view, the focus should be on discourse communities of teachers that "encourage teacher learning, but also serve as organizing tools to keep teachers working together, sharing, and learning from one another over time". (Lieberman & Mclaughlin, 1992, p. 674). Consequently, less attention should be given to formal decision-making structures within schools--at least until an authentic teacher culture has been established. This view shows decision-making as following, not necessarily leading, the creation of an vital teacher culture.

Strategy 5: Implementing new power arrangements within SBM will require viewing the change process as a journey yet managing the change itself carefully

In the early literature on the local change process, change was seen in terms of a set of linear stages progressing from initiation through implementation to institutionalization. Interestingly for implementing site-based management, Fullan (1991) portrays this structure as four boxes in linear sequence ranging from initiation through implementation to continuation and finally to **outcomes**. The special dilemma for enhancing site-based decision-making is that

outcomes are to be considered only after full implementation and continuation (institutionalization) has been achieved. This linear structuring of the change process obviously is problematic for site-based management as it has been practiced to date.

Recently, authors in the change literature have shifted their perspective about the relationship of "planning" and "doing". Fullan and Miles (1992) proposed that change should be viewed as a journey (as opposed to a blueprint), and where the message, "...is not the traditional plan, but do then plan, do and plan some more." (p. 749). They report that even the development of a shared vision that is central to reform is better thought of as a journey in which people's sense of purpose is identified, considered, and continuously shaped and reshaped. This finding has two implications for decision-making within site-based management. The first, obviously, is that planning and doing will be intertwined in ways that take decision-making well beyond a rational model of planning and then deciding. Second, it raises again the importance of a shared vision which must be a part of site-based decision-making in ways that will be explored later in the chapter.

The view of change as a journey also points to the importance of coping strategies as ways to make decision-making structures more effective. Since change cannot be developed as a blueprint, no specific plan can last for very long because it will either become outmoded due to changing external pressures or because disagreement over priorities will rise within the organization (Louis & Miles, 1991). The style of coping strategy adopted by the school is very important to decision-making success. Louis and Miles (1991) report that deep coping (the key to solving difficult problems of reform) is not a matter of muddling through but requires reflection, data and consideration of multiple points of view about problems before effective decisions can be made. Louis and Miles (1991) classified coping styles ranging from relatively shallow ones (doing nothing at all, procrastinating, doing it the usual way, easing off or increasing pressure) to

deeper ones (building personal capacity through training, enhancing system capacity, comprehensive restaffing, or system restructuring/redesign). They found that schools that were least successful at change always use shallow coping styles. They also report that the enemies of good coping are passivity, denial, avoidance, conventionality, and fear of being too radical. Good coping is active, assertive, inventive. It goes to the root of the problem.

They report that coping appears more likely when schools are, "working on a clear, shared vision of where they're heading, and when they create an active coping structure (e.g., a coordinating committee or steering group) that steadily and actively tracks problems and monitors the results of coping efforts. Such a structure benefits from empowerment, brings more resources to bear on problems, and keeps the energy for change focused" (Fullan & Miles, 1992, p. 750).

Louis and Miles (1991) report that improvement is a "problem-rich process" and that, "change threatens existing interests and routines, heightens uncertainty and increases complexity." (Fullan & Miles, 1992, p. 750). Schools that have viable decision-making structures are ones that love problems and seek to solve them. Louis and Miles report schools typically bumped into three or four major problems (and several minor ones) with reform efforts: problems that range from poor coordination to staff polarization and from lack of needed skills to heart attacks suffered by key figures. They see problems as arising naturally from the demands of the change process itself, from the people involved and from the structures and procedures of schools and districts. The need for decision groups to embrace problems as the only viable way to create meaningful solutions is an important finding. Louis and Miles report, "too often, change related problems are ignored, denied, or treated as an occasion for blame and defense. Only by tracking problems can we understand what we need to do next to get what we want."

Enhancing Knowledge

In Mohrman, Lawler and Mohrman (1992), knowledge includes the knowledge and skills,

"that enables employees to understand and contribute to organizational performance." (p. 1). It is important to consider knowledge and skills in the context of three aspects of work in school settings that are reported to be, "critical in influencing the appropriateness of different involvement approaches: 1) the degree of interdependence, 2) the degree of complexity, and 3) the amount of uncertainty that has to be reduced. Education is arguably high on all these factors, although the organization designs and technology that are currently employed do not necessarily acknowledge that fact." (p. 7).

Strategy 1: Use knowledge informed by the new view of schooling and the diverse nature of students.

The local change process literature offers several important and useful perspectives about the interdependence, complexity, and uncertainty of school-based knowledge. Knowledge in school settings is uncertain for the usual reasons: political diversity about goals, lack of verifiable about teaching and learning, and the loose organizational structure. However, several new perspectives on knowledge uncertainty are extremely important to the current efforts in restructuring. The first of these is the shift in student demographics which has challenged researchers and practitioners to develop new knowledge about student engagement, learning and student outcomes. These highly demanding outcomes are goals for all students and new wisdom is needed about how to carry out each of the schooling components in the context of these new goals. Doubly troubling is the problem of integrating teaching, learning, organizational structure, curriculum, and assessment around these new goals; it's the integration that is more demanding at a knowledge and comprehension level than is knowledge about individual components of the reform.

This knowledge can be developed several ways during the implementation process. An antecedent phase prior to initiation of the reform across the school or district has helped

individual teachers become aware of new approaches to curriculum and teaching. Marsh and Odden (1991) found that during the antecedent phase, teachers learned through contact with other teachers outside the school that typically featured sustained contact (weeks of interaction--not hours), common experiential learning, sharing of success and reflection on practice, and networks that supported knowledge application by teachers in the own schools.

National and state task forces can effectively communicate this knowledge through reports that present an integrated vision of the new approach to schooling. Marsh and Crocker (1991) found that these reports educated local participants about the reform, provided credibility and validation of the ideas and the local leaders who supported them, and sustained local momentuum during difficult time in the local change process.

Fullan (1991) reports that districts can enhance this knowledge by having superintendents who, "actively and systematically worked on the familiar ingredients for success: setting goal and expectations, selecting staff, supervising and supporting professional development, focusing on instruction and curriculum,ensuring consistency, and monitoring instructional programs." (p.209). Local knowledge of the reform was also enhanced through initial awareness training, sustained local assistance, and visits to lead schools.

Peer review processes involving quality indicators based on the new reforms also enhanced local knowledge of the reforms. Marsh and Crocker (1991) found that these reviews supported self-study (including reflection and critical review) of their reform efforts, provided feedback that enhanced local knowledge, and provided a common technical language that supported further growth of local knowledge.

Strategy 2: Use narrative and paradigmatic knowledge about schooling

Not only will new knowledge be needed, but also a new view of knowledge. We previously thought of knowledge in paradigmatic or propositional terms. Brunner (1990) provides

a constructivist views of knowledge based more on narrative and craft insight than proposition or paradigms per se. It is the very thinking/meaning centered curriculum we intend for students that is paralleled in the need for a thinking/meaning centered knowledge base for teachers and other school practitioners. The way site-based decision-making arrangements (either strategic or day-to-day) utilize this new view of knowledge itself, and the new integrated knowledge about schooling, will be closely related to the success of those decision-making structures. Decision structures that use outdated views of technical knowledge will most likely not be successful.

This new type of knowledge can be developed during the implementation process. Sparks (1983) found that teachers need to talk about their learning during workshops, and that reflective journals help teacher create personal insights and new meaning around professional activities. Teachers do need to experience this type of knowledge generation in workshops, and talk about its qualities. But most importantly, norms about the types of knowledge which can be appropriately used in SBM will be needed, and these can be discussed and practiced during the implementation of SBM.

Strategy 3: Implementation strategies must build both programmatic specificity and conceptual clarity as a knowledge base for SBM

McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) emphasize the importance of both programmatic specificity and conceptual clarity as ways of understanding SBM. Programmatic specificity often is reflected in detailed statements, typically in writing, and describe the intended change. This type of knowledge would typically be found among a few leaders early in the implementation process. Conceptual clarity about the overall reform is a type of knowledge that evolves over time and is the experience-based understanding that practitioners have of this change and its meaning both for them and for the school.

Similarly, Fullan and Miles (1992) point out that understanding change as a process of

learning also puts ownership in perspective. In their view, "ownership of a reform cannot be achieved **in advance** of learning something new, a deep sense of ownership comes only through learning. In this sense, ownership is stronger in the middle of a successful change process than at the beginning and stronger still at the end. Ownership is both a process and a state." (p. 749). Consequently, both knowledge and ownership will evolve in complex ways in major change efforts.

Building programmatic specificity during the implementation process is a matter of clarity of expression about what SBM consists of and how it will work. Strategies for developing conceptual clarity among participants in SBM will be more difficult. Problems, for example, could be used to build conceptual clarity about SBM among participants as part of the implementation process. Change facilitators need to anticipate that participants will want to renegotiate their SBM arrangements as their understanding of it develops. In short, this knowledge can not be "frontloaded" in the implementation process.

Strategy 4: Utilize networks and cross-role teams to build knowledge of both schooling and school change

It is likely that different role groups participating in decision-making within SBM will need networks to other decision-making groups and with role-alike participants at other schools. Lieberman and McLaughlin (1992) point to a number of dilemmas which must be avoided in using networks to enhance the creation of effective decision-making structures and approaches within SBM. First, report Lieberman and McLaughlin, "networks typically are unencumbered by bureaucratic restrictions and are free of traditional form of inspection which creates excitement because there is no old political or social baggage to carry and teachers play a leading role in the venture" (p. 650). Unfortunately, this autonomy may create problems of quality, application, and stability for the network. There's also the danger that networks create such a sense of

independence for teachers that the decision-making structure then is difficult to operate. They warn that it may be especially difficult to link to student successes or schooling experiences across the whole school.

Networks could aid implementation more effectively if they were managed by district/school cross-role teams. Odden (1991) reports that many studies have found cross-role teams to be important vehicles for managing the implementation process. Cross-role teams could provide the institutional focus which networks need without having teachers "submit" to administrative control. Cross-role teams linked the local organization vertically and provided both the clinical expertise of teachers with the gatekeeping functions of administrators. Cross-role teams could also link teachers to each other in the local setting and help translate the knowledge gained from networks into organizational learning at the local site.

Strategy 5: School leaders need a deep understanding of the purposes and "connectedness" of schools

A related approach to building an effective decision-making structure within a school is to focus teachers at the school in a sustained discussion of desired student outcomes and schooling arrangements. Sizer (1992) provides an extensive and intriguing scenario in his book Horace's School where a leadership committee of teachers and administrators engaged in discussion and reading that leads to a proposal for a dramatically refined school. This sense of in-depth discussion carried on in a sustained manner is an important way to build knowledge that will be vital to implementing site-based decision-making. Barth (1990) provides a similar view of members of the school community being a "community of scholars" and a "community of learners". Ad hoc strategies for engaging in discussion and reflection are provided in this exciting book. The challenge will be to help site-based decision-making groups engage in this type of deep reflection while also making more technical/managerial and time-urgent decisions.

Strategy 6: Develop knowledge through an appropriate use of training

Traditional approaches to staff development offer (at their best) powerful models of training that enhance site-based decision-making. Joyce and Showers (1988) provide an extensive synthesis of the staff development literature in a way that is relevant to training for site-based decision-making. They point to four major outcomes of training: awareness, knowledge, skill application, and use of training in natural settings. They also point to five major components of the training process as including:

1. Knowledge/theory. This strategy provides site-based decision-makers with an understanding of the overall theory and constructs some site-based decision-making principles.
2. Modeling/demonstration. This approach helps site-based decision-makers understand simulated and actual examples of site-based decision-making. Modeling typically should include both process and product modeling which (in the case of site-based decision-making) shows participants the process of engaging in decision-making and typical results.
3. Practice. Site-based participants in decision-making would have a chance to practice relevant skills and cultural norms in a workshop setting. Multiple rounds of practice and discussion are important to the success of this training component.
4. Feedback. Feedback should include both structured and unstructured feedback to help decision-making participants have a chance to talk about their feelings and perceptions regarding site-based decision-making (unstructured feedback) and to examine their own practice against some criteria of excellence (structured feedback).
5. Coaching for application. Coaching for application includes assistance and observation by peers or experts concerning the use of decision-making strategies in their natural setting. Learning teams could observe each other and then have periodic discussions with experts

in the decision-making process as well as with experts in the substance of school restructuring.

To build awareness-level understanding, only knowledge and modeling components of training are necessary. But to have extensive transfer of training into natural settings, all five components -- **especially with coaching** -- are necessary. In turn, without the coaching component, transfer is extremely weak. Successful coaching includes many of the elements found in the discussion of networks above. The implementation of SBM will need extensive training for local site participants and for related roles including students, parents, district leaders and policymakers. Training should focus on teams not individuals and provide sustained assistance and on-site application (coaching).

Strategy 7: Provide multiple forms of assistance to enhance knowledge

Training alone will not be sufficient to implement SBM in educational settings. More comprehensive and integrated forms of assistance will be needed to build the knowledge and skill base. Huberman and Miles (1984) propose eight kinds of assistance as follows:

1. CON (Control): The assister exerts pressure aimed at making the receiver do something.
2. TTR (Teacher/training): The assister explicitly transmits information, developing receiver skill, and so on, usually in a structured way.
3. SOL (Solution giving): The assister gives the receiver "answers," advice, or solutions to problems.
4. RES (Resource adding): The assister provides materials, money, time, or other resources needed by the receiver.
5. ADV (Advocacy): The assister actively represents the interest of the receiver to some other audience (such as administrators or funders).

6. FAC (Facilitation): The assister aids the receiver to achieve goals, giving at-the-elbow assistance with the process being used.

7. INQ (Inquiring): The assister collects data from the receiver, or from the implementation situation more generally, and feeds it back in a "formative evaluation" to aid in the next steps.

8. SUP (Support): The assister provides encouragement, reinforcement, or emotional support to the receiver.

(Huberman & Miles, 1984, p.106)

Huberman and Miles (1984) provide several other lessons for the implementation of SBM, including:

1. SBM should be complex, well-designed, and demanding for practitioners to implement. Strong district support for SBM is critical.

2. Sustained assistance that integrates all of the types of assistance list above will be needed over several years of implementation.

3. The latitude of what constitutes SBM should be kept no wider than moderate during the early implementation phase, and be closely linked to assistance.

4. Successful implementation typically includes reports from practitioners that the early going is "very rough"--great care should be taken not to "downsize" SBM at that time. Moreover, a drop in participant morale should be anticipated in the short run.

Enhancing Information

Strategies for implementing SBM need to include specific ways that the availability and use of information can be decentralized and improved within the organization. In this context, the redesign of the information element will involve helping the organization become more outcome-driven. Shifting from a rule and input driven organization to one focused on outcomes will be a

major shift for most school districts, and the decentralization and improvement of the use of information must be set in this new organizational orientation.

Redesigning the availability and use of information in the organization must also be done in light of the new reforms themselves. For example, the organization will need to know about newly emphasized types of student outcomes such as how students think and solve problems or how students are prepared to participate meaningfully in citizens in a complex society. The organization will also need to know about teaching and learning that has new features, and how these teaching and learning is contributing to achieving these outcomes. Finally, the new organization will need not only to shift information from the "top" to the "bottom", but also to connect the top and bottom through the redesigned use of this information.

The local change literature suggests four strategies for using information in these new ways:

Strategy 1: Focus on teacher-centered collaborative development of new information use

Experience with several teacher-centered collaborative efforts to develop decentralized and new uses of information in schools suggest strategies for how to implement the information element of SBM. (see early efforts by Lauren Resnick in the new Standards Project, by Ann Brown in the UC Berkeley/schools collaborative, by Howard Gardner in Project Zero, and the Coalition of Essential Schools). Critical elements for successful use of new information are:

1. Sustained contact between researchers and teachers that builds on teachers craft knowledge and classroom reality.
2. Use of networks of teachers across schools that have the characteristics of teacher networks described by Lieberman and McLaughlin above.
2. Collaborative invention of performance assessment and reflection strategies that reduce the "seam" between learning and assessment.

3. Planning backwards from the new student outcomes.

Strategy 2: Strengthen the way information is shared and used within the school and district

Another strategy for enhancing information use within SBM is to alter how information is used in the relations between districts and schoos. Fullan (1991) reports that districts with a strong and effective district presence in the schools, "...provided the site with a variety of school-specific performance data, discussed these data with the principals and set expectations for their use, and monitored, through recognized procedures how and with what success the schools used the performance data" (LaRocque & Coleman, 1989, as cited in Fullan, 1991, p. 205) The nature of the discussion should be collaborative rather than prescriptive. Sites then developed plans for improvement, although the process in developing and implementing the plans was monitored. Conversely, in districts that were stuck, Rosenholtz (1989) reports that, "...with little helpful asistance, stuck superintendents symbilically ccommunicated the norm of self-reliance and subsequently professional isolation." (cited in Fullan, 1991, p. 208). Establishing positive qualities in the interaction between the district and the site will be critical to implementing new arrangements for information within SBM.

Strategy 3: Launch an evolving systemic redesign of information use

The design of the information use will require a change process featuring a well-designed innovation, commitment from district and school leadership, cross-role teams to coordinate the implementation, sustained assistance combined with pressure to enhance implementation, and teacher effort to try the new use (Odden, 1991). The evolving systen will also need to grow out of the experience of the teacher-centered collaborative efforts and the new dymanic patterns between district and school described above.

Strategy 4: Use information about the change process itself in new ways

The ways that information is used in the implementation process itself will strongly influence the use of information more generally in the organization. Many effective school leaders have used information about student performance as a way of portraying the current situation at the school as being unacceptable. They used this strategy to counter the common view in schools that: a) current practice should be seen as adequate, and b) only the proposed changes need to be justified. Information about schooling is quite difficult to obtain both for political and technical reasons. It is unlikely that most effective site-based decision-making groups will be able to gain access to meaningful information without extensive efforts to overcome these political and technical barriers.

Fullan and Miles (1992) emphasize the importance of information about implementation problems when they say, "Only by tracking problems can we understand what we need to do next to get what we want." (p. 750). They emphasize that problems must be taken seriously, ie, not attributed to "resistance" or to the ignorance or wrong-headedness of others. Strategies for obtaining deep understanding of problems will require information gaining analysis strategies well beyond quantitative manipulation of conventional data.

Similarly, Fullan (1991) emphasizes that one of the main purposes of the process of implementation is to "exchange your reality of what should be through interaction with implementers and others concerned" (p. 105). The information needed for this exchange of reality must be subtle and qualitative, and is vital to the success of site-based management efforts. Fullan (1991) also emphasizes the need to get information about teachers views regarding need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practice of the innovation. This information would help avoid the dangers of "false clarity" where participants have a superficial understanding of the needed changes.

Enhancing Rewards

Focusing decision-making on achieving various outcomes and the rewards from them at the school will be a difficult and major transformation of the school, as seen by the local change process literature. The local change process/restructuring literature, however, has a number of insights which would help this aspect of decision-making become effective in school settings.

Strategy 1: Use a range of meaningful rewards.

The local change process literature identifies a number of rewards which teachers find meaningful in school settings. Many of these are psychosocial in nature and include a sense of satisfaction of having helped individual students and having made a difference in their lives. Teachers find extra time and materials useful to their teaching also to be rewards. The point is that schools have typically not been driven primarily by financial incentives, although teachers have appreciated extra pay for attending staff development sessions or taking on leadership roles in schools. It must be pointed out, however, that these monetary incentives have been fairly modest. Lortie (1975) points out that all male teachers in his sample who were 40 years old or older had a second job or a major hobby which attracted their time and energy. These teachers tended not to think of teaching as a place where they could gain extra dollar incentives.

To help establish various rewards in a school setting, it will be important to use a range of rewards that include psycho-social as well as monetary ones, and to work with teachers to establish the credibility and cultural acceptance of these rewards. Attempts to lay rewards on schools from outside have been notoriously unsuccessful in the past.

Strategy 2: Focus on balancing teacher empowerment and accountability as a cultural, political, and technical issue.

The problem is to establish both teacher empowerment and decision-making while also establishing accountability for student outcomes in programs in the school setting. Teachers must play a key role in feeling empowered while also feeling accountable in schools. In the short run,

strategies for enhancing rewards as part of decision-making in SBM will need to try one of two strategies--utilize either empowerment-dominated or accountability-dominated efforts.

In the absence of clear outcomes about schools (which many authors have described at length) schools are likely to shy away from outcomes of any type and instead rely on factors such as bureaucratic safety, response to external pressure, or approval of peer elites. Fullan (1991) points out that, "in the absence of clearly defined output criteria, whatever is popular among leading professional peers is sometimes the determining criteria" (p. 60). In some respects, this responsiveness to peer pressure is positive and important; however, the responsiveness increasingly must become linked to school outcomes. The design of rewards must include provision for the political stability of desired outcomes and a coherent design for SBM that aligns the incentives for site personnel.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the conceptualization of SBM was based on important work by Lawler and Mohrman and was defined as decentralizing power, knowledge, information and rewards within systemic redesign of the educational system. Strategies drawn from the local change process literature were proposed for enhancing the implementation of decentralization of power, knowledge, information and rewards. Three conclusions can be drawn from the analysis presented in the chapter.

The first conclusion is that site-based management (SBM) in educational settings has not been successful to date, and that weak implementation processes were part of the problem. Too often, SBM was treated as an isolated innovation which was intended to improve curriculum and instruction, enhance site decision-making, create new staff roles, and improve student assessment. However, its actual effects have been limited to changes in the lives of adults at the school, and even there, decision-making has not been fundamentally revised. Its lack of effectiveness has

been linked to weak implementation processes that included lack of time, inadequate participant training, and unresolved issues involving the links between the district and the school. Weak implementation was also found to result when participants confused satisfaction about the empowerment of adults with performance success for students.

The second conclusion is that SBM within systemic reform will require a robust implementation process. An antecedent phase of the change process must allow selected participants a chance to develop expertise and a professional culture which allows these leaders to guide the initiation and implementation phases of the reform. Initiation must include careful design of SBM within systemic reform. For this, strong central office support will be needed to create a reform that addresses issues of power and empowerment between the district and the site. A cross-role team must guide the implementation process which itself will need resources and management.

Successful implementation will feature sustained assistance that balances training and control with inquiry and support for all participants, and links assistance with pressure to implement the reform and incentives for effort. Participants will also need to be networked with SBM efforts at other sites to share ideas and build a reflective professional culture. Care must be taken, however, that the networks are linked to the systemic reform effort at the local site--the danger is that the evolving professional culture will serve individual adult participants at the expense of the collective effort to reform the schooling experience for students.

The final conclusion is that successful implementation of SBM will require much more than decentralizing existing concepts of power, knowledge, information and rewards within the existing organization. Instead, new forms of knowledge and information linked directly to student outcomes like conceptual understanding and critical thinking will be needed. For this to happen, new assessment approaches (like performance assessment) and models for teacher-centered

information use must be developed. A cultural/political shift in schools towards an outcome focus for the organization and careful links between results and rewards must be developed.

References

Barth, R. S. Improving Schools From Within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Berman, P., & Gjelten, T. Improving School Improvement: A Policy Evaluation of the California School Improvement Program. Vol. 2: Findings. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler Associates, 1984.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: Vol. VIII. Implementing And Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation,1978.

Bruner, J.S. Acts Of Meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Clune, W.H., & White, P.A. School-Based Management: Institutional Variation, Implementation, And Issues For Further Research. New Brunswick, NJ: Eagleton Institute of Politics, Center for Policy Research in Education, 1988.

Crandall, D., et al. People, Policies And Practice: Examining The Chain Of School Improvement (Vols. 1-10). Andover, MA: The Network, 1982.

Cuban, L. "Reforming, Again, Again, And Again." Educational Researcher, 1990, 19(3), 3-13.

David, J.L. Restructuring In Progress: Lessons From Pioneering Districts. In R.F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation Of Educational Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Fullan, M. The Meaning Of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press, 1982.

Fullan, M. The New Meaning Of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991.

Fullan, M., & Miles, M. "Getting Reform Right: What Works And What Doesn't." Phi Delta Kappan, 1992, 73(10), 745-752.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. Change In Schools: Facilitating The Process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Havelock, R. The Change Agent's Guide To Innovation In Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology, 1973.

Hood, P., & Cates, C. Alternative Approaches To Analyzing Dissemination Linkage Roles And Functions. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory, 1978.

Huberman, M., & Miles, M. Innovation Up Close: How School Improvement Works. New York: Plenum, 1984.

Joyce, B. (Ed.). Changing School Culture Through Staff Development: 1990 ASCD Yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. Student Achievement Through Staff Development. New York: Longman, 1988.

Lawler, E.E. High-Involvement Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.) Building A Professional Culture In Schools. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Lieberman, A., & McLaughlin, M. "Networks For Educational Change: Powerful And Problematic." Phi Delta Kappan, 1992, 77, 673-677.

Little, J.W. "Norms Of Collegiality And Experimentation: Workplace Conditions Of School Success."American Educational Research Journal, 1982, 19(3), 325-340.

Little, J.W. "Teachers As Colleagues." In Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective. New York: Longman, 1987.

Little, J.W., Gerritz, W.H., Stern, D.S., Guthrie, J.W., Kirst, M.W., & Marsh, D.D. Staff Development In California: Public And Personal Investments, Program Patterns And Policy Choices. San Francisco: Joint publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and Policy Analysis for California Education, 1987.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Louis, K., & Miles, M.B. Improving The Urban High School: What Works And Why. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991.

Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. "Professional-Patron Influence On Site-Based Governance Councils: A Confounding Case Study." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1988, 10(4), 251-270.

Marsh, D.D., & Bowman, G.A. "State Initiated Top-Down Versus Bottom-Up Reform." Educational Policy, 1989, 3(3), 195-216.

Marsh, D., & Crocker, P. "School restructuring: Implementing middle school reform." In Odden, A. (Ed.), Education Policy Implementation. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Marsh, D., & Jordan-Marsh, M. "Addressing Teachers' Personal Concerns In Staff Development Efforts." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985.

Marsh, D., & Odden, A. "Implementation Of The California Mathematics And Science Curriculum Frameworks." In Odden, A. (Ed.) Education Policy Implementation. Albany, NY: SUNY, 1991.

McDonald, J.P. Exhibitions: Facing outward, pointing inward. Reston, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992.

McLaughlin, M., & Marsh, D. "Staff Development And School Change." Teachers College Record, 1978, 80(1), 69-94.

Mohrman, S., Lawler, E., & Mohrman, A. Applying Employee Involvement In Schools. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Center for Research in Education Finance, 1992.

National Center on Education and the Economy. America's Choice: High Skills Or Low Wages! The Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. Rochester, NY: The National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990.

Odden, A. (Ed.). Education Policy Implementation. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Resnick, L. "Performance Assessment And The Measurement Of Educational Quality: Work In Progress." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1992.

Rogers, E. Diffusion Of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Rozenholtz, S. Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization Of Schools. New York: Longman, 1989.

Sarason, S. The Culture Of The School And The Problem Of Change (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1982.

Sarason, S. The Predictable Failure Of Educational Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Schlechty, P.C. Schools For The 21st Century. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Sevilla, J, & Marsh, D. "Inquiry-Oriented Science Programs: New Perspectives On The Implementation Process." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, April 1992.

Shanker, A. "Staff Development And The Restructured School." In Joyce, B. (Ed.), Changing School Culture Through Staff Development: 1990 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990.

Shavelson, R., Baxter, G., & Pine, J. "Performance Assessments: Political Rhetoric And Measurement Reality." Educational Researcher, 1992, 21(4), 22-27.

Sizer, T.R. Horace's School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

Smith, M. & O'Day, J. Systemic Reform. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Policy Research in Education, 1990.

Sparks, G. "Synthesis Of Research On Staff Development For Effective Teaching." Educational Leadership, 1983, 41(2), 65-72.

Wiggins, G. "Teaching To The Authentic Test." Educational Leadership, 1989, 46(7), 41-47.

Wohlstetter, P., & Buffett, T. "Decentralizing Dollars Under School-Based Management: Have Policies Changed?" Educational Policy, 1992, 6(1), 35-54.

Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, A. Rethinking School-based Management Policy and Research. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Center for Research in Education Finance, 1992.

Chapter Contributor Bibliographical Statement

David D. Marsh is the Robert A. Naslund Professor of Curriculum Theory at the University of Southern California. His research interests include curriculum and instructional leadership, the process of change in educational organizations, teacher education and the continued professional development of teachers, program evaluation, qualitative research, administrators as instructional leaders, and the comprehensive reform of schools. He received his B.S. (1965) in Asian Studies, a M.S. (1968) in history/education, and a Ph.D. (1973) in Curriculum and Instruction all from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.